UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,604	07/01/2003	Nancy Rahn	29488/38226A	6147

4743   7590   04/01/2009
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357

EXAMINER
ALTSCHUL, AMBER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3686	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/611,604	RAHN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMBER L. ALTSCHUL	3686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 July 2003</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>October 27, 2003</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-57 have been presented for examination.

Priority

2.   This application claims priority of United States Provisional Patent Application 60/393075 filed on July 1, 2002. Applicant's claim for the benefit of this prior-filed application is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 27, 2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,550,734, Tarter, et al., hereinafter Tarter.

6.   As per claim 1, Tarter teaches a method for reconciling third party payor receivables with a set of prescription transactions comprising the steps of:

obtaining prescription claim data associated with the set of prescription transactions, each of the set of prescription transactions corresponding to a prescription claim, (column 23, lines 49-60);

obtaining third party deposit data associated with the set of prescription transactions, (column 22, lines 57-67);

obtaining third party payor data associated with the set of prescription transactions, (column 22, lines 57-67);

obtaining remittance advice associated with the set of prescription transactions, the remittance advice comprising a plurality of remittance advice line items, each remittance advice line item associated with one of the prescription transactions of the set of prescription transactions, (column 32, lines 66-67 and column 24, lines 1-12);

configuring the prescription claim data, the third party deposit data, the third party payor data, and the remittance advice into a pharmacy automated accounts receivable system (PARS) database to form PARS data, (column 10, lines 39-62);

automatically reconciling third party deposit data, wherein a failed reconciliation attempt automatically facilitates at least one process of automatic and manual reconciliation, (column 43, lines 41-49).

7.   As per claim 2, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the step of configuring the data results in generating a plurality of user-

interactive graphical displays based on the PARS data, (column 19, lines 1-19 and column 46, lines 11-18).

8.   Regarding claim 3, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1-2 as described above. Tarter further teaches enabling adjustments to the data in the PARS database via the plurality of user-interactive graphic display screens, (Figures 17-17P, and column 19, lines 1-19).

9.   Regarding claim 4, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1-3 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein adjustments to the data in the PARS database facilitate reconciliation of third party payor receivables, (column 2, lines 13-34).

10.   As per claim 5, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the step of automatically reconciling third party payor receivables includes the step of automatically identifying prescription transactions representing a need for manual reconciliation by a PARS user, (column 14, lines 22-41).

11.   As per claim 6, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the manual reconciliation process is one which attempts to match remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches to deposit batches and/or sub-batches comprising the steps of:

(a) selecting a criteria on which to base a work queue via a system user-interactive graphic display screen, (column 7, lines 1-11);

(b) building the work queue based on the selected criteria, (column 39, lines 31-45);

(c) selecting an available unmatched remittance advice batch or sub-batch line item displayed on the work queue, (column 23, lines 66-67 and column 24, lines 1-12);

(d) selecting an unmatched deposit line item displayed on the work queue, (column 24, lines 22-

34);

(e) causing a match verification between the selected remittance advice line item and the selected

deposit line item, (column 44, lines 51-64);

(f) determining if the match correctly corresponds to the deposit and, in the affirmative, deleting

matches from the work queue and comparing non-matches to a predetermined threshold,

(column 44, lines 10-17);

(g) creating a plan level item for matches found in step (f), (column 44, lines 10-17);

(h) reiterating steps (c) through (g) for items not found to match in

step (f), (column 44, lines 51-64).

12.   As per claim 7, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 6 as described above. Tarter

further teaches wherein the manual reconciliation process is initiated after a failed automatic

attempt to match remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches to deposit batches and/or sub-

batches, (column 7, lines 1-11).

13.   As per claim 8, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further

teaches wherein the manual reconciliation process is one which attempts to match remittance

advice batches and/or sub-batches with prescription claims comprising the steps of:

(a) displaying a list of unresolved remittance advice batches or sub-batches remaining after

completion of an automatic attempt to match remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches to

individual prescription claims, (column 7, lines 1-11);

(b) selecting an unresolved remittance advice batch or sub-batch from the list, (column 24, lines

22-34);

(c) determining if a selected remittance advice line item(s) from the selected remittance advice batch or sub-batch is available for matching, (column 24, lines 22-34);

(d) building a work screen based on the selected remittance advice batch or sub-batch, (column 44, lines 10-17);

(e) selecting an unmatched remittance advice line item and an unmatched prescription claim item from the work screen, (column 24, lines 22-34);

(f) causing a match verification between the selected remittance advice line item and the unmatched prescription claim item, (column 24, lines 22-34);

(g) determining if the match correctly corresponds to the prescription claim item and, in the affirmative, deleting the matches from the work queue, (column 39, lines 50-64).

14.   As per claim 9, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 8 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the failure of step (g) to determine a correct match, results in additional user-interactive graphic display screens provided for a system user including claim history screens, side-by-side comparison screens showing specified remittance advice line items with prescription claims, screens to allow a user to perform a deposit transfer adjustment, and/or screens allowing user to manually enter remittance advice data, (column 29, lines 1-11).

15.   As per claim 10, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the step of automatically reconciling third party payor receivables includes the step of reconciling deposit batches or sub-batches with remittance advice batches or sub-batches wherein the remittance advice is identified with deposit identification, (column 29, lines 42-57).

16.   As per claim 11, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 10 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein reconciliation determines a remittance advice sub-batch status of matched or unmatched, (column 7, lines 1-11 and column 24, lines 22-34).

17.   As per claim 12, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 10-11 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the remittance advice sub-batch status of unmatched results from the difference of remittance advice sub-batch monetary amount and third party deposit amount transgressing a predetermined monetary threshold, (column 24, lines 22-34).

18.   As per claim 13, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 10-11 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the step of automatically reconciling third party payor receivables includes the step of reconciling deposits with remittance advice sub-batches wherein the remittance advice sub-batch is identified by one of store identification and group identification, (column 5, lines 25-39).

19.   As per claim 14, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 13 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein reconciliation determines a remittance advice sub-batch status of one of matched, unmatched, and ambiguous, (column 23, lines 66-67 and column 24, lines 1-12).

20.   As per claim 15, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the step of automatically reconciling third party payor receivables includes the step of reconciling unmatched remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches with unmatched deposits comprising the steps of:

(a) determining which processor identifiers require matching, (column 28, lines 6-12);

(b) selecting a processor identifier, (column 28, lines 6-12);

(c) selecting unmatched remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches associated with the selected processor identifier, (column 23, lines 66-67 and column 24, lines 1-12);

(d) selecting unmatched deposits associated with the selected processor identifier, (column 24, lines 22-34);

(e) compare sum money totals associated with the unmatched remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches with the sum money totals associated with the unmatched deposits, (column 24, lines 22-34);

(f) when money amounts match, changing the state of the remittance advice batches and/or sub-batches and deposit batches and/or sub-batches to a matched state, (column 44, lines 10-17);

(g) repeating steps (a) through (t) until remaining processor identifiers are examined, (column 44, lines 10-17 and lines 51-64).

21.   As per claim 16, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein the step of automatically reconciling third party payor receivables includes the step of reconciling remittance advice line items from remittance advice batches previously matched to a deposit to individual prescription claims comprising the steps of:

(a) selecting remittance advice batches previously matched to a deposit, (column 30, lines 3-13);

(b) selecting prescription claims, (column 44, 10-17);

(c) selecting non-workers compensation claims, (column 5, lines 35-39);

(d) comparing the selected remittance advice line items to the selected prescription claims based on pass 1 parameters to ascertain which remittance advice line items are either matched or unmatched, (column 23, lines 66-67 and column 24, lines 1-12);

(e) performing step (d) using the remaining remittance advice line items and the selected

prescription claims based on pass 2 parameters, (column 44, lines 10-17 and column 44, lines 51-

64);

(f) performing step (e) using the remaining remittance advice line items and the selected

prescription claims based on pass 3 parameters, (column 44, lines 10-17 and column 44, lines 51-

64);

(g) performing step (f) using the remaining remittance advice line items and the selected

prescription claims based on pass 4 parameters, (column 44, lines 10-17 and column 44, lines 51-

64);

(h) performing step (g) using the remaining remittance advice line items and the selected

prescription claims based on pass 5 parameters, (column 44, lines 10-17 and column 44, lines 51-

64);

(i) determining if the selected remittance advice batches have a truncated prescription number,

(column 21, lines 30-38).

22.   As per claim 17, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 16 as described above. Tarter

further teaches wherein a match determined in steps (d) or (e) results in updating the remittance

advice line item to a state of matched and the prescription claim status is updated to reflect a

match to the remittance advice line item, (column 29, lines 1-11).

23.   As per claim 18, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 16 as described above. Tarter

further teaches wherein a match for all variables, except a date of service variable within a

predetermined range, determined in steps (f) or (g) results in updating the remittance advice line

item(s) to a state of matched and the prescription claim status is updated to reflect a match to the remittance advice line item, (column 29, lines 1-11).

24.   As per claim 19, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 16 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein a match for all variables, except a date of service variable within a predetermined range, determined in step (h), results in updating the prescription claim state to reflect a need for a manual remittance advice to claim matching process, (column 29, lines 42-57).

25.   As per claim 20, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 16 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein remittance advice batches determined to have truncated Rx numbers in step (i) are compared to claims based on pass 6 parameters to ascertain which remittance advice line item(s) are either matched or are unmatched, (column 7, lines 1-11 and column 24, lines 22-34).

26.   As per claim 21, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 16 and 20 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein unmatched remittance advice line item(s) reflect a need for a manual remittance advice to claim matching process, (column 29, lines 1-11).

27.   As per claim 22, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 16 and 20 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein matched remittance advice line item(s) result in updating the remittance advice line item(s) to a state of matched and the prescription claim status is updated to reflect a match to the remittance advice line item(s), (column 24, lines 22-34).

28.   As per claims 23-28, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 16-22 above.

29.   As per claim 29, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 28 as described above. Tarter
further teaches wherein the plurality of claim status parameters include missing deposit, non-
sufficient funds, stop payment, suspended claim, claim without matching remittance advice,
short paid claim, plan audit, claim audit, manual claim, special handling claim, claim determined
to require rebilling, rejected claim, contested chargeback claim, claim requiring retroactive
billing to a third party, claim requiring refund/payback to a third party, and/or a claim having a
credit balance, (column 41, lines 12-38).

30.   As per claim 30, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 28-29 as described above.
Tarter further teaches wherein an affirmative claim status parameter results in initiating at least
one of a plurality of processes, (column 19, lines 60-65).

31.   As per claim 31, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 28-30 as described above.
Tarter further teaches wherein the processes include collections, billing, billing exceptions, and
payment exceptions, (column 43, lines 50-65).

32.   As per claim 32, Tarter teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Tarter further
teaches wherein the step of automatically reconciling third party deposit data results in an
identification of a claim to have a status of either resolution requires adjustment, resolution
requires a claim search, or resolution requires a claim history search, (column 45, lines 41-51).

33.   As per claim 33, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 as described above. Tarter
further teaches wherein a claim identified as requiring adjustment facilitates a plurality of user
interactive graphic display screens to allow a system user to adjust prescription claim
information, (column 19, lines 1-19 and column 46, lines 11-18).

34.   As per claim 34, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein a claim identified as requiring a claim search facilitates a plurality of user interactive graphic display screens to allow a system user to search a plurality of criteria in the PARS database, (Figures 17-17P, and column 19, lines 1-19).

35.   As per claim 35, Tarter teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 as described above. Tarter further teaches wherein a claim identified as requiring a claim history search facilitates a plurality of user interactive graphic display screens to allow a system user to view claim history and its associated criteria, (column 19, lines 1-19 and column 46, lines 11-18).

36.   As per claims 36-53, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-35 above.

Conclusion

37.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

38.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amber L. Altschul whose telephone number is (571) 270-1362. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5, F 7:30-4, every other Friday Off.

39.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gerald J. O'Connor can be reached on (571) 272-6787. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300.

40.   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-8219.

41.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) computer-accessible medium. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR computer-accessible medium, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR computer-accessible medium, contact

the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance

from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

computer-accessible medium, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

/A. L. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 3686
March 23, 2009

                                                    /Gerald J. O'Connor/
                                                    Supervisory Patent Examiner
                                                    Group Art Unit 3686